

**R E M A R K S**

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the arguments set forth fully below. Previously, claims 1-29 and 33-44 were pending. In the Office Action mailed April 1, 2005, claims 26-29 and 33-44 are allowed and claims 1-25 are rejected. By the above amendments, claims 1 and 10 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-29 and 33-44 are still pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-6, 10-15, 18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of United States Patent No. 4,191,971 to Dischert et al. (hereinafter "Dischert").

In particular, it is asserted within the Office Action that claims 1, 6, 10 and 15 are unpatentable in that Applicants' admitted prior art discloses an apparatus/method for receiving video signals from video cameras, comprising a multiplexer for selecting a camera video signal from a plurality of video cameras and a video decoder for receiving a selected one of the plurality of video signals. It is acknowledged that the Applicants' admitted prior art does not disclose a controller coupled to the video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter. However, it is further asserted that Dischert teaches a system for connecting a plurality of video signals comprising a controller coupled to a video recorder for conditioning the video recorder according to a parameter. It is therefore concluded that it would have made obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the conventionally well known concept as taught by Dischert so that the controller is coupled to the Applicants' admitted prior art video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants' admitted prior art discloses a plurality of (n) video cameras 102, 104 and 106 coupled to provide a video signal to a respective input of a multiplexer 108. A select input of the multiplexer 108 conditions the multiplexer 108 to route a selected one of the video signals from the cameras 102-106 to an output of the multiplexer 108. The video signals formed by each camera 102-106 typically vary from each other in frequency (i.e. horizontal line rate, chrominance subcarrier frequency), phase (i.e. relative position of the beginning of lines and

frames, phase of the chrominance subcarrier), amplitude (i.e. peak to peak luminance amplitude, chrominance subcarrier amplitude) and dc offset. Each of these characteristics is represented as a parameter.

An output of the multiplexer 108 is coupled to a video decoder 110. The video decoder 110 receives a selected video signal from the multiplexer 108, synchronizes its internal circuits to the video signal, controls gain levels, performs dc restoration on the video signal and places the video signal into a format suitable for storage in a storage device 112 and for display by a display device 114. The multiplexer 108 is typically utilized to cycle through the cameras 102-106 in a sequence such that at least one complete frame is received from each camera and stored in the storage device 112 before moving to a next camera in the sequence. In this manner, a series of sequential frames is obtained by each camera 102-106 and stored in the storage device 112 for later retrieval. As each camera 102-106 is selected by the multiplexer 108, the video decoder 110 must be re-conditioned in order to properly process the video signal provided by the selected camera. A finite amount of time is required to re-condition the video decoder 110 each time the multiplexer 108 selects a video signal from a different one of the cameras 102-106 in the sequence.

Before the video decoder 110 becomes conditioned, also referred to as stabilized, the video decoder 110 first locks onto synchronization pulses of the video signal, thereby aligning itself horizontally and vertically with received video signal. Then, the video decoder 110 locks onto the chrominance subcarrier (which is a component of the video signal), performs dc restoration and adjusts gain levels. Because each of these steps must be performed before the next, this process of conditioning the video decoder 110 is time consuming. Typically, several frames are received by a video decoder 110 before the decoder is conditioned according to the video signal of the selected camera 102-106. In other words, the video decoder 110 receives the video signal, and from the received video signal determines the various parameters necessary for conditioning the video decoder 110 to a particular one of the cameras 102-106. These determined parameters are then used to condition the video decoder 110.

In contrast to the Applicants' admitted prior art, the apparatus of the present invention includes a modified video decoder 310 and controller 326 to provide previously stored parameters to the video decoder 310 for conditioning. The parameters provided by the controller 326 are specifically associated with a selected one of the video signals. In this manner, the video decoder 310 does not need to first process the selected one video signal in order to determine the

parameters before conditioning itself. According to the present invention, the controller 326 obtains previously stored parameters associated with the selected one video signal, and the controller 326 provides these parameters to the video decoder 310 for conditioning. The video decoder 310 is specifically configured to accept the parameters from the controller 326, and once accepted, to use the parameters to condition the video decoder 310 according to the selected one video signal associated with the accepted parameters.

Within the Office Action, it is acknowledged that the Applicants' admitted prior art does not teach a controller coupled to the video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter. It is further asserted that Dischert does teach this limitation. Dischert teaches two different types of controllers, a set up control 27 and operator's controls 19, 219. However, neither type of controller conditions a video decoder according to a previously stored parameter representative of a selected one video signal.

Each of the camera processors of Dischert is controlled by a dedicated controller. The operator's control 19 is coupled to the camera processor 21, and the operator's control 219 is coupled to the camera processor 221. The operator's controls 19, 219 are used to provide operator's adjustments while the camera is performing in an operational mode (Dischert, col. 2, lines 3-5). In other words, the operator's controls 19, 219 provide operator's adjustments to the camera processors 21, 221 on the fly. The operator's controls 19, 219 do not provide previously stored operator's adjustments to the camera processors 21, 221.

The set control 27 provides set up adjustments to the camera processors 21, 221 prior to the operational mode. The set up adjustments are uniformly provided to both camera processors 21, 221 via cable 227 (Dischert, Figure 1; col. 2, lines 55-60). In other words, the same set up adjustments are sent to both camera processors 21, 221. The set up control 27 does not provide set up adjustments representative of a select one of the camera processors 21, 221.

Further, there is no hint, teaching or suggestion that the video decoder 110 of the Applicants' admitted prior art is either configured to accept parameters from a controller, such as the proposed controller 19, 27, 219 of Dischert, or configured to utilize parameters received from a controller to condition itself. The video decoder 110 is specifically configured to condition itself based on processing a received video signal. Therefore, the asserted combination of the controller of Dischert with the video decoder 110 of the Applicants' admitted prior art is not proper since the video decoder 110 is not configured to receive and implement parameters. As such, the asserted combination should be withdrawn.

In summary, Dischert is cited as teaching a controller coupled to a video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter. As discussed above, Dischert does not teach a controller that conditions a video decoder according to a previously stored parameter representative of a selected one video signal. It is acknowledged within the Office Action that the Applicants' admitted prior art does not teach a controller coupled to the video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter. Therefore, neither the Applicants' admitted prior art, Dischert, nor their combination teaches a controller that conditions a video decoder according to a previously stored parameter representative of a selected one video signal. Further, the asserted combination of the Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert is not proper and should be withdrawn.

The independent claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for receiving video signals from a plurality of video cameras. The apparatus of claim 1 includes a selector having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals, a video decoder coupled to an output of the selector wherein the video decoder receives a selected one of the plurality of video signals and a controller coupled to the video decoder wherein the controller conditions the video decoder according to a previously stored parameter representative of the selected one of the video signals. As described above, neither the Applicants' admitted prior art, Dischert, nor their combination teaches a controller that conditions a video decoder according to a previously stored parameter representative of a selected one video signal. Further, the asserted combination of the Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert is not proper and should be withdrawn. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert.

Claims 2-6 depend from the independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert. Accordingly, claims 2-6 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent claim 10 is directed to an apparatus for receiving video signals from a plurality of video cameras. The apparatus of claim 10 includes a selector having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals, a video decoder coupled to an output of the selector wherein the video decoder receives a selected one of the plurality of video signals and a controller coupled to the video decoder wherein the controller conditions the video decoder according to a plurality of previously stored parameters representative of the selected one of the video signals. As described above, neither the Applicants' admitted prior art, Dischert, nor their combination teaches a controller that conditions a video decoder according to a

previously stored parameter representative of a selected one video signal. Further, the asserted combination of the Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert is not proper and should be withdrawn. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 10 is allowable over the teachings of Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert.

Claims 11-15, 18, and 22 depend from the independent claim 10. As discussed above, claim 10 is allowable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert. Accordingly, claims 11-15, 18, and 22 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, claims 7, 16-17 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,139 to Cooper et al. (hereinafter "Cooper"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 7, 16-17 and 23 depend from the independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed above, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert. Accordingly, claims 7, 16-17 and 23 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, claims 8-9 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,659 to Vincent (hereinafter "Vincent"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 8-9 and 24-25 depend from the independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed above, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert. Accordingly, claims 8-9 and 24-25 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, claims 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,167,021 to Holmes (hereinafter "Holmes"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 19-21 depend from the independent claim 10. As discussed above, claim 10 is allowable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert. Accordingly, claims 19-21 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,  
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: 7-1-05

By: Thomas B. Haverstock  
Thomas B. Haverstock  
Reg. No. 32,571  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR 1.6)

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

- 13 -

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP.

Date: 7-1-05 By: John D. Owens